

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

9 JONATHAN LAWRENCE DENNINGTON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 DANIEL T. SATTERBERG, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14 Case No. C18-1348-RAJ

ORDER

15 The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's Complaint (Dkt. # 4), Plaintiff's Motion for
16 Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order (Dkt. # 5), the Report and
17 Recommendation of Brian A. Tsuchida, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. # 6),
18 Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation and Plaintiff's Motion for
19 Reconsideration (Dkt. # 8), and the remaining record.

20 The Court concurs fully in the recommendations of the Report and
21 Recommendation. As explained by Judge Tsuchida, a federal court "will not intervene in
22 a pending criminal proceeding absent extraordinary circumstances where the danger of
23 irreparable harm is both great and immediate." Dkt. # 6 at 2-3 (citing *Younger v. Harris*,
24 401 U.S. 37, 45-46 (1971)). Plaintiff has made no such showing. Plaintiff's objections
25 also vaguely assert that *Younger* does not apply because it involves constitutional issues
26 separate from Plaintiff's criminal proceedings. Dkt. # 8. However, Plaintiff's vague
27 objections fail to address Judge Tsuchida's well-reasoned determinations that Plaintiff's
28

1 criminal proceedings are (1) ongoing, (2) implicate important state interests, and (3)
2 allow Plaintiff opportunities to raise his constitutional issues. Dkt. # 6 at 3. In these
3 circumstances, *Younger* abstention applies.

4 Plaintiff has also styled his objections as a “Motion for Reconsideration,”
5 ostensibly requesting this Court “reconsider” Judge Tsuchida’s R&R. Dkt. # 8. Motions
6 for reconsideration are disfavored and will be granted only upon a “showing of manifest
7 error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been
8 brought to [the court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local R. W.D.
9 Wash. 7(h)(1). Plaintiff’s Motion contains no new evidence or legal authority, and
10 ignores the basic reality: this is a request for a federal court to interfere with pending state
11 criminal proceedings based solely on vague constitutional references. Dkt. # 8. *Younger*
12 disapproves of such an intervention.

13 Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 6),
14 **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order
15 (Dkt. # 5), **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. # 8), and **DISMISSES**
16 this case without prejudice.

17
18 DATED this 25th day of October, 2018.
19
20



21
22 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28